

Appl. No. : 10/644,179
Amdt. Dated: January 30, 2009
Reply to Office Action of July 10, 2008

REMARKS

Claims 11-16, 18 and 20-24 stand rejected. Claims 11, 21 and 23 have been amended herein. Therefore, claims 11-16, 18 and 20-24 are pending and at issue. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and allowance of the case. Applicants would also like to thank the Examiner for withdrawing the previous rejections of the claims.

Claims 11-14, 16 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Byrns. This rejection should be withdrawn as Byrns fails to disclose or suggest one or more features recited in independent claims 11, 21 and 23. Specifically, independent claim 11 recites that the panel includes an open-ended channel and that the open-ended channel extends substantially the entire length of the panel wall. Further, claim 11 also recites that the attachment portions of the mounting structures are laterally slidably receivable in the channel. Byrns simply fails to disclose or suggest these features.

Specifically, referring to Figure 2, Byrns discloses a number of tabs 36 which extend downwardly and away from a strengthening rib 32 thereby defining a number of spaces between the tabs 36 and the back wall of the drawer front. However, as readily seen in the figures, the spaces are relatively small and located at discrete locations such that they cannot be considered to define an open-ended channel that extends substantially the entire length of the panel wall. Furthermore, the strengthening rib 32 would interrupt and prevent a channel from extending substantially the entire length of the panel.

Moreover, claim 11 recites that the attachment portions of the mounting structures are laterally slidably receivable in the channel. Byrns also fails to disclose this feature. Again referring to Figure 2, Byrns discloses, at best, that the tabs are vertically slidable over the frame

Appl. No. : 10/644,179
Amdt. Dated: January 30, 2009
Reply to Office Action of July 10, 2008

bends 56 and 60. In fact, the strengthening rib 32 is designed to prevent lateral movement of the drawer front. As seen in Figure 2, the strengthening rib 32 in Byrns essentially abuts the frame bend 60 on each side of the drawer front, thereby preventing lateral movement.

Therefore, for the above reasons, Byrns fails to disclose or suggest one or more features recited in independent claim 11 such that the rejection should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Independent claim 21 recites similar features to those discussed above with respect to claim 11. For example, claim 21 is a method claim that recites the steps of providing a drawer panel with an open-ended channel that extends substantially the entire length of the panel and slidingly inserting the attachment portion of the first mounting structure in the channel along a lateral direction. Therefore, for similar reasons to those discussed above with respect to claim 11, the rejection of claim 21 should also be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claim 23 also recites similar features to those found in claim 11. For example, claim 23 recites a drawer panel with an open-ended channel that extends substantially the entire length of the panel. As discussed *supra*, Byrns fails to disclose or suggest such features. Additionally, claim 23 recites the attachment portion of the mounting structure including a folded under portion and being slidably receivable in the channel of the front panel for mounting the front panel on the drawer body in a mounted condition extending across a front end of the drawer body and the folded under portion overlying and contacting another portion of the attachment portion of the mounting structure. Byrns also fails to disclose or suggest these features. Therefore, for these reasons, the rejection of claim 23 should be withdrawn and the claim allowed.


Appl. No. : 10/644,179
Amdt. Dated: January 30, 2009
Reply to Office Action of July 10, 2008

The remaining claims depend directly and/or indirectly from claims 11, 21 and 23. These dependent claims more specifically recite the features of the independent claims and therefore the rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the present amendment, reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and allowance of the case. If any fees are due in connection with this application, the Patent Office is authorized to deduct the fees from Deposit Account No. 19-1351. If such withdrawal is made, please indicate the attorney docket number (25493-457390) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joseph H. Herron
PTO Reg. No. 53,019
Seyfarth Shaw LLP
Attorneys for Assignee
131 South Dearborn Street
Suite 2400
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5577
312-460-5000
312-460-7000 (fax)